

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 420

SP 033 248

AUTHOR Romerdahl, Nancy Sue
TITLE Shared Leadership in a Professional Development Center.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Collegiality; Higher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Leadership; *Middle Schools; *Peer Relationship; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

The Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC) was established in 1989 as a partnership between the University of Washington and four middle schools. PSPDC has created collaborative and substantial teacher leadership roles. In performing the role of teacher leader coordinator (TLC), teachers: (1) were fully participating members of the PSPDC planning and policy making committee; (2) worked to connect the PSPDC mission to their schools and to bring the school's point of view to bear on that mission; and (3) collaborated with peers to promote further teacher leadership and to implement the PSPDC vision. Four TLCs participated in this study to determine how teachers share leadership in a collaborative professional development school. Interviews, observations, and artifact analyses yielded six tentative hypotheses: (1) TLCs influence the direction of PSPDC by being the rudder or at times the brakes; (2) TLCs rely on the bureaucratic legitimacy of the PSPDC or the school to gain compliance; (3) TLCs initially lead their peers by following the path of least resistance; (4) TLCs lead their peers by using persuasive techniques; (5) in the leadership role, the TLCs attend to the feelings of all involved; and (6) with time, TLCs established their own aura of leadership, and thereby began to legitimize their position with their peers. (IAH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED337420

SHARED LEADERSHIP IN A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

by

Nancy Sue Romerdahl

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991

SP 033 248

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Romerdahl

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nancy Sue Romerdahl
University of Washington
115 Miller Hall, DQ 12
Seattle Washington 98195

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Chicago, April 3 - 7, 1991

Shared Leadership in a Professional Development Center

Introduction

As state legislatures prepare to "throw out the books" of rules and regulations that govern education in order to turn the governance and the responsibility for student achievement to the parents, teachers, and school boards, teachers are in a position to truly influence the direction that education should take. Further, influential groups such as the Holmes Group (1986) and Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) contend that one way to improve education is to increase the attractiveness of teaching by increasing teacher leadership. And teacher unions are demanding that teachers have a voice in the governance of public schools if they are expected to be held accountable for student achievement. All this suggests that teachers have a share in the leadership of the schools in which they work.

Teachers significantly sharing in the leadership of schools is a complex concept. Barriers to shared leadership by teachers make its attainment difficult. Teachers have traditionally valued an egalitarian view of teaching (Lortie, 1975). Teachers often work in isolation from each other (Sarason, 1975; Gehrke, 1987). The teaching force consists primarily of women, yet men continue to dominate administration (Apple, 1989; Silver, 1988), and in the past teachers have been victims of reform rather than instigators (Wasley, 1989).

However, if recent calls for shared leadership and worker empowerment are indicative, a significant change is in the wind (Ouichi, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982). Educational leadership, once viewed as administrators *causing* teachers toward to work toward appropriate educational goals, now more often means the attempt to make the goals of administrators and the goals of teachers be common goals (Bass, 1978; Goodlad, 1988). Schools, districts, and even entire states are attempting to create systems whereby leadership is not viewed as finite, but can be shared in any number of ways (WEA n.d.). They are engaged, as Lieberman (1988) suggests, in "building a professional culture in schools".

Leadership and collegiality become closely related concepts as leadership is shared. Teachers are being encouraged to assume roles that combine both and the notion may be unfamiliar to all concerned. The question addressed in this paper is **how do teachers share leadership in an organization that deliberately encourages teachers participation?**

Background

Several experiments are currently in progress that have teacher participation as a stated goal. These school/university partnerships, called professional development schools, hold leadership expectations for practicing teachers that are new and different --and exciting. A professional development school (PDS) is associated with a university and is designed for the induction of new teachers into the profession and the continuing growth of practicing teachers. Further, it relies on the wisdom not only of the university faculty but also of the people in the school, especially teachers, to help design experiences for student teachers as well as for practicing teachers. One goal is that the PDS should become a place for the development of "a career opportunity calling for superior qualifications and carrying with it greater prestige" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 300).

Several roles exist in professional development schools that call for teacher leadership. In some cases, teachers are cooperating teachers who work with interns and with the university. In other cases, teachers make decisions about the creation of experiences for their peers that are aimed at school improvement. They are mentors and peer coaches. Teachers become inquirers into school practices. Finally, teachers collaborate in determining the direction of the PDS in which

they work. Some teachers may play only one role while others may combine several.

In all of these roles, PDS teacher leaders move beyond their classrooms to engage in activities outside their ordinary experiences. Some of these roles have traditionally belonged to either university professors or to school administrators; some are new. As teachers assume these roles, they are stepping out of their normal and expected roles. While they remain classroom teachers, they are also something more: they are teacher leaders.

Teacher participation in such efforts designed to increase the professionalism of teaching is problematic. Teachers must be able to interact effectively with decision-makers who traditionally have been their hierarchical superiors, that is school administrators or university professors. In addition, they must be able to be effective in leadership roles with their peers in a profession that values egalitarianism.

Within a PDS team, some teacher leaders operate in three contexts: the PDS governance body, their individual schools, and as liaison between the two. It is assumed that the meaning of the teacher leader role, as with the administrator or professor role, is created by interactions with others in the environment, and that an understanding of the context in which the teacher leaders work is essential to understanding the role.

While much has been written about PDS models (Milton, 1988; Zimpher, 1988; Brandt, 1985) and about teacher empowerment from an administrator's point of view (Hallinger 88; Osterman, 1989), fewer empirical studies have focused on teachers as they are involved in collaborative efforts. (See, however, Wasley, 1990)

Perspective

This study will attend to teacher leadership phenomena as teachers interact with others in two directions. On the one hand, they work with professors and administrators to create the PDS as an entity--its direction and purpose, or vision. On the other hand, they work to enable their peers in their schools to carry out the mission of the PDS. Thus, at times they have the option to assert leadership to **create** the vision of the PDS; at other times, they might work to **empower others** in their schools to be teacher leaders; finally, they can **direct** or manage activities at their sites. Using the distinction that Bennis and Nanus (1985) have made, at times they can be thought of as leaders, who influence, guide the direction of the organization, and think about what should be, and at other time they can be thought of as managers, who get things done.

Three assumptions guide this inquiry. First, there is a distinction between leadership and management. Leadership is different than management, although leaders participate in both.

'To manage' means 'to bring about, to accomplish, to have charge of or responsibility for, to conduct.' 'Leading' is 'influencing, guiding in direction, course, action opinion.' The distinction is crucial. *Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.* The difference may be summarized as activities of vision and judgement-- *effectiveness* --versus activities or mastering routines--*efficiency*. (Bennis and Nanus, 1985)

Teachers in professional development schools have opportunities to be leaders if they indeed help determine the direction that the PDS is to take. If instead they only carry out the directives that others (professors, administrators, etc.) plan, then they are managers, another step in the hierarchy between teachers and professors or administrators.

As Post (1985) stated, "leaders create and managers regulate" (p. 7). Within this paradigm, how teacher leaders contribute to the PDS vision determines their status as leader; how they contribute to their school's vision determines their status as leader. But how they "get things done" determines their status as managers.

A second assumption is that leadership can indeed be shared, that power is not necessarily triangular shaped with the power concentrated at the top. This "transformational leadership" model is summarized by Burns (1978):

Some define leadership as leaders making followers do what followers would not

otherwise do, or as leaders making followers do what the leaders want them to do; I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations--the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations--of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations" (p. 18).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) describe such a transformational leader as "one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change" (p. 3). One critical component of a PDS is that teachers are encouraged to be leaders by the PDS; in turn, these teacher leaders encourage leadership in other teachers.

A third assumption is that women's ways of leading may be qualitatively different than those of men. The major participants in this study are all women; the behaviors and attitudes that I describe are based on observations of what these women do and say. I suggest this caveat that echoes many others (Miller, 1976; Gilligan, 1982; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986): the findings of this study may be limited because these teacher leaders are all women; it is possible that men teacher leaders would exhibit different behaviors. In general, Miller (1976), Gilligan (1982), and Belenky, et al. (1986) suggest that women may be particularly tuned to the feeling tone of situations, aware of the interrelations among the participants of the organization, and conscious of the desires and needs of members of the group.

Background for this study

The Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC) was established in 1989 as a partnership between the University of Washington and four middle schools. The center's goals were threefold: create a model teacher education program for middle grade teachers, promote teacher leadership in the continuing professional development of practicing faculty, and begin systematic inquiry into middle grade programs and practices.

The PSPDC has created teacher leadership roles designed to be collaborative and substantial. In one of these roles, teacher leader coordinators (TLCs) joined university professors, school administrators, and representatives from the state education association and the office of the state superintendent for public instruction on the PSPDC planning committee, the governance body. The twenty-six members of the Planning Committee spent time reflecting on the state of education (particularly, in this case, relative to education at the middle level) and on the needs of the member schools. They set policy and make decisions about directions and general activities to be initiated.

The role of the TLC as articulated by the planning committee was multi-faceted. First, the TLCs were fully participating members of the planning committee. Second, the TLCs worked to connect the mission of the PSPDC to their schools and to bring the school's point of view to bear on that mission. They presided at meetings of teacher leaders at their sites, then shared the results with the planning committee. Finally, they collaborated with peers to promote further teacher leadership and to implement the vision of the PSPDC. They encouraged other teachers to take responsibility for organizing, planning, and/or attending PSPDC sponsored events, such as symposia, speakers, university classes, etc.

Method

Four teacher leaders coordinators participated in this effort to determine how teachers share leadership in a collaborative professional development school. Their role in three contexts were examined: the planning core of the PSPDC, their individual schools, and as they operated as liaison between the two. This study was based on grounded theory method outlined by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in which theory arises from data gathered from observed phenomena.

Data Source

Because leadership in the role of the teacher leader in a professional development center was the focus of this study, the primary participants in this study were four teacher leader coordinators who were a part of the Puget Sound Professional Development Center and who

taught in four PSPDC middle schools. While there were other teacher leaders in the PSPDC, it was the TLCs who made the total population of teacher leaders with a unique relationship in which they helped create the form and direction for a new entity, the PSPDC, and also directed professional activities at their sites. These TLCs were interviewed and also observed as they interacted with others in their role as teacher leader coordinator. Journals that they kept during their 1989-1990 experience provided further data.

Secondary participants included the principals in the PSPDC sites, other members of the planning committee, other PSPDC teacher leaders, and non-PSPDC teachers at the sites.

A third source of information for this study was documents created by the PSPDC, official notes from PSPDC meetings, and public documents created by the specific sites.

Description of the primary participants

Each of the teacher leader coordinators (TLC) was an experienced teacher. Their years of experience ranged from twelve to twenty years. Each was a well respected teacher by peers and their principal and well versed in middle school philosophy. Both these characteristics, being an experienced teacher and being a good teacher, are characteristics noted by Brownlee (1979) as being prerequisites for teacher leadership.

The TLCs taught a variety of subjects. One teacher taught math. She, of the four, was the one most concerned with structure and order; she more consistently and frequently communicated in writing with her staff. In addition, she had one class period reallocated for her PSPDC duties. A second TLC taught English, and team-planned with two other teachers. She also worked as a cooperating teacher, having a student teacher the entire school year. This teacher, by choice, worked a .8 day. A third TLC was called a "house administrator", and performed many duties associated with a vice principal. She, of all the TLCs had the most flexible time, though she felt pressure from her staff when she was away from school for PSPDC activities. The fourth TLC taught speech; she also worked with a student teacher. She was the only one of the four to teach a full day, and she also reported the most frustration related to time.

In addition to their teaching responsibilities and cooperating teacher responsibilities, the TLCs had several direct PSPDC responsibilities.

They were responsible for participation on the monthly planning committee meetings for the PSPDC.

They led site meetings. This meant that they were responsible for creating an agenda and then presiding at the meetings.

They were responsible for PSPDC activities held at their school, such as colloquia and outside speakers. They were encouraged to have other teacher leaders be responsible for preparing the event or sharing the work to do so.

They were responsible for their budgets, and for seeing that funds were dispersed to other teacher leaders. They were responsible for year-end budget reports.

They were responsible for attending the monthly planning committee meetings for the PSPDC and for participating in subcommittees.

They were responsible for meeting regularly with the PSPDC director and the other TLCs.

They were responsible for screening and interviewing prospective student teachers as well as being "hostess" to these students. They were partially responsible for the student teacher placement.

They were responsible for speaking to other groups, including parent groups, other teaching staffs in their district, or other professional groups at state and national conferences.

Teacher leader coordinators were responsible for encouraging teachers to participate in PSPDC activities, such as seminars, colloquia, pre-service teacher education sessions, university level classes such as those on peer coaching and site based decision making, action research, and other similar activities. At this time, the TLCs were not, themselves, necessarily aiming to be mentors, peer coaches, or instructional leaders in their schools. Rather, it was a PSPDC aim that a culture be created in which such collegial participation by teachers be broad-based.

Data Gathering.

All primary participants were observed in ten monthly PSPDC planning meetings. In addition, each teacher leader coordinator was interviewed three times: once in the winter of 1990, once in the spring of 1990, and finally in the fall of 1991. Each of the four of the teacher leader coordinators was studied as she functioned in two tasks: planning committee member and site leader. Each was observed at least once as she worked in each specific roles, such as leading a site meeting, participating in a colloquium, or presenting a paper at a conference.

Secondary participants were interviewed once. Interview protocols focused on definitions of leadership and how leadership operates in specific contexts.

The teacher leader coordinators were informed of findings as they evolved and were invited to participate in the analysis by giving their interpretations. In this sense, as they reflected, the TLCs helped create the meanings to be located in this study.

Data Analysis

"Grounded theory is derived from data and then illustrated by characteristic examples of data," (Glaser & Strauss, p. 5). In a grounded theory study, data are analyzed by creating conceptual categories which can be compared.

Observations of each of the TLCs were compared with minutes of PSPDC meetings, TLC journals, and with interviews with others PSPDC participants (planning committee members and principals and teachers from the sites). The contexts in which the TLCs work were described through observations of the sites, interviews with principals and professors, previous portraits of the sites, and other public documents. As they emerged, data were jointly collected, coded and analyzed in order to develop a theory of teacher participation in shared leadership.

Findings

These interviews, observations, and artifact analyses have yielded tentative hypotheses that illuminate the case of shared teacher leadership in a professional development school. As they are tentative hypotheses, they are offered as beginning points for further study. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) point out, further observations should either fit these hypotheses or yield new hypotheses that encompass both.

Several hypotheses emerged from this study; six will be illustrated here. These will first be explained, then as in the canon of grounded theory, they will be illustrated rather than proven.

Hypothesis One:

Teacher leader coordinators influence the direction of the PSPDC by being the rudder or at times the brakes.

A rudder and brakes are not usually found on the same vehicle, yet this metaphor will work for some distance here. A rudder serves to keep a ship or boat traveling on a straight course, but it also serves to help it change direction. It operates under water and out of sight. Brakes, of course, serve to slow or stop a vehicle; sometimes it is necessary to slow down or stop before changing course. As will be illustrated, there were times when the TLCs perceived themselves to be powerless, or didn't trust their own right to be heard. Some of the teachers in this project had been involved in previous years with projects or committees that had, in the end, proven to be wasted time. Consequently, perhaps, and particularly in the early stages of PSPDC implementation, some TLCs did not always see their goals, their school's goals, and the goals of the PSPDC as being common goals.

The TLCs provide direction by speaking for their school, indicating which direction the schools will or will not go. It may be that the TLCs align themselves first with their school, then with the PSPDC. One TLC was quite blunt:

The PSPDC is not and never will be a top priority. My family is at the top, my students next, the various hats I wear at school . . . are next, then comes the PSPDC, with my priorities there being: my fellow teacher leaders, my principal, my student teacher, my links with other TLCs, and finally, my links to the other members of the PSPDC, most of whom are affiliated with the university.

Decisions concerning the direction for the PSPDC were officially made by the planning committee, the governance group, and the TLCs served on this board. However, during the first year, the agenda for each planning committee meeting was created by the university professor who served as center director and the university staff. Each month, before the planning committee meeting, the director met with the associate director (who was responsible primarily for the student intern seminar and student intern experiences), another professor who was responsible for evaluation efforts, and three graduate students. The purpose for these meetings was to plan the agenda for the following planning meeting. The conversation in these meetings was about the needs of the schools, the concerns of the TLCs and the principals, and requirements from others, such as sponsoring agencies or the university, and items noted from previous planning committee meetings. These concerns and needs were rudders; they determined the content of planning committee meetings.

The schools often served as the catalyst for activities arranged by the PSPDC. One school in particular was having some trouble, and some staff were experiencing stress. Following conversations with the TLC as well as with the principal, the director took the opportunity to work with the university School of Social Work to place social work interns at that school to work with students. In addition, she also worked with the Department of Educational Counseling and Psychology to place graduate students in the schools to lead "peer counseling" circles with staff members. The TLCs were responsible for discussions at their sites and for arranging these placements.

TLCs attempt to put on the brakes. Sometimes this is reflected in discussion outside a formal meeting, and sometimes the formal planning committee or other systematic meetings serve. They sometimes viewed the PSPDC planning meeting as a place to settle conflicts between the PSPDC and the schools. A conference being planned was perceived by one TLC as being premature in timing. Further, she felt that the director wanted the conference because of the need to disseminate what the PSPDC was finding and she had a sense of urgency. It was anticipated that "at this next meeting, I'm sure this is going to be duked out, simply because we can't go much longer without having things really firmly set". In another case, one TLC felt that expectations for a particular teacher role was changed from its inception; if the teacher, the principal, and the PSPDC director were not able reach an agreement, then the TLC expected to bring the matter up at a planning meeting.

One TLC explained that there were times when the schools and the PDC, at such moments called "the University", were at cross purposes. If, she said, each unit were to list its most important reasons for being, the schools would not list "To be a professional development center" at the top. She went on to tell of a time when, on relative short notice, the director of the PSPDC asked for a teacher leader to speak to a group on a Saturday. This TLC did not have a teacher leader available for this activity not, she explained --defensively--, because the teacher leaders weren't professional and didn't feel a professional responsibility, but because the notice was short, and they were already committed to other teacher leadership activities, primarily involving students.

One TLC, reading a letter from the PSPDC director's office, quoted "you will recall that you agreed to . . ." and she fumed, "I didn't 'agree' to this. I don't have a teacher leader who can do this." At that point, it was not her intention to persuade someone to take responsibility for the chore that was requested by the PSPDC.

When things had gone awry, such as when other teacher leaders failed to attend meetings, one TLC felt that she was chastised by the director. The TLCs felt it was her responsibility to share staff feelings with the director, to explain --to make her understand-- why other teachers did not attend. While they often relied on the principal to do this (as discussed below), they might unite with the principal, and "dig in their heels", as one TLC put it, thus providing a brake.

In the planning year and again in the beginning year of the operation of the PSPDC, the TLCs were fully included as members of the PSPDC planning committee. It was their right to voice their concerns and state their positions in the meeting and in conversation with their principals and university professors and staff, and indeed they often did so. Their ideas commonly were reflected in planning committee decisions. Yet, there were instances where statements were

made in meetings and some of the TLCs remained silent, thereby appearing to consent; they sometimes voiced dissatisfaction at a later date or in private. There were other instances where they exclaimed the impossibility of a particular action so that another action would have to be substituted. They provided leadership by being a rudder, unseen perhaps, but by making the direction most obvious.

Hypothesis Two

The teacher leader coordinators rely on the bureaucratic legitimacy of the PSPDC or the school in order to gain compliance.

Building on the premise that teachers have little positional power of their own and command no "authority" it appeared that the TLCs borrowed on the legitimate authority of the PSPDC. When asking for help for a function, at times the TLCs put it in terms of "'They' have asked me to. . ." They used "distancing" pronouns in order to maintain their egalitarian status with their peers; this status may be critical in terms of their having the right to ask for acceptance of their leadership.

When the TLCs resented being in the middle as liaison between the PSPDC and their peers, they referred to the PSPDC as "the university", or "they", and the director as "she". The use of the term "they" placed distance between the TLC and the PSPDC and thereby absolved the TLC of responsibility for imposing. When the TLCs spoke of disagreements with the PSPDC, consistently, the pronoun "they" or "the university" was used. This held true even when teachers are playing their "liaison" role and were placed in a position of defending the actions or statements of the PSPDC to the teachers. One teacher lamented in her journal:

I'm made to feel responsible for everything done at the PSPDC --when teachers resent missing out on their classes or whatever, I get the flak. Then I get the flak from the U for teachers not being motivated more to be leaders.

Distancing pronouns were used by the TLCs at other times as well, as when one TLC expressed appreciation for books and periodicals "you guys have given us".

Similarly, the TLCs at times turned to their principal with PSPDC problems. One TLC did not wish to attend an out-of-state conference; she asked the principal to speak with the PSPDC director. Difficult situations are relegated to the principal, such as when there was a conflict over money or a problem with the district central office. For example, someone in a district office sent a TLC a letter that was contrary to what she knew to be the correct PSPDC procedure; the TLC turned the situation over to the principal.

It appears that when TLCs needed to interact with their peers, they at times relied on "orders from headquarters", the PSPDC, in order to protect their standing in their social and professional group. In addition, when they need to handle a delicate situation with their "superiors", they relied on the support of their principal.

Hypothesis three

The teacher leader coordinators initially lead their peers by following the path of least resistance.

This appeared to be an initial step for each of the TLCs in this study. During the planning year, the TLCs were not particularly visible in their particular schools as they worked with the PSPDC. As they began the implementation year, PSPDC activities were visible to the teachers, and the teachers were invited to participate in these activities. This particular strategy served as a way to spread the leadership responsibilities to others in the school.

TLCs went to those they knew and trusted first. "I know the people in our building who are willing to go that extra step, that extra mile to be involved, so I just go to them initially".

TLCs called in chits; they asked for help on a personal basis. "You can get them to do something on a personal level, which is how I got them to do anything in the PSPDC, just because I've worked with them for so long."

TLCs avoided confrontation; they avoided non-cooperative teachers. One TLC flatly stated "I leave them alone!" A second was more expansive:

Those people who are not supportive generally, --the information is given to them, but I do not go out of my way to try to get them., to pull them into . . . I get defensive easily, and I have had a few confrontations with one teacher specifically, and it's better, it's just better for me to stay clear. You know, I put the information in the boxes so no one can say "I never know about that," but going to them personally and trying to get them involved . . . I'm just not doing that.

In the initial stages, following the path of least resistance appeared to be a manageable step for TLCs as they began to assert their leadership in a new enterprise, the PDSPC.

Hypothesis Four

The teacher leader coordinators lead their peers by using persuasive techniques.

Teachers work in settings in which egalitarian behavior is the social norm (Lortie, 1975). As Little (1988) stated, "even the simple etiquette of teacher leadership is unclear". She noted that teachers are cautious in their dealings with each other, often so much so that they are ineffective. In the present case, then, how did teachers go about getting others to participate in PSPDC activities when the norm for egalitarianism was so entrenched?

One strategy frequently used by the TLCs was persuasion, which can be thought of as an opposite of mandating.

Though they held a special position as TLC, they continued to desire to be "one of the gang", to protect their social standing with their peers. One TLC explained that when the principal

asked me to be a teacher leader coordinator, I said: 'It's got to be low -key, I don't want a lot of attention brought to it because I don't want to be seen as the . . . you know, the brown-noser, or the goodie two-shoes who will do whatever the boss wants to do. Again, I think because of this idea of 'we're all getting paid the same and don't rock the boat; don't do more and --because of how it makes us look'

There's a certain amount of resentment towards people doing more than what they are supposed to be doing.

Spencer (1986) called this "rate-busting", referring to "teachers who always take work home, stay after school, or come to school on weekends" (p. 8). These teachers, Spencer concluded, were resented by other teachers.

Nevertheless, the teacher leader coordinators did request teachers to participate in PSPDC activities, to do "extra" work, and were able to cause many teachers to respond.

TLCs avoided being bossy; clearly, they had no power to demand any action by other teachers. "You just don't do much mandating" one TLC explained. They said "please", They ask politely: "Would you mind doing this?"

Persuasion also took the form of flattery. They sweet-talked, and they gently "arm twisted". Sweet-talk, arm-twisting and flattery often are the same thing. When one TLC wanted another teacher to accept a certain chore, she went to him

on a personal basis and said, 'you know we really could use another man. (A teacher) said she though you'd be really good; she met you and thought you'd be great.' -- A little flattery, sometimes a little begging. . .

Another mocked herself:

So I do a lot of kind of arm twisting and coaxing: "Yes, yes indeed, you could go out and

you could speak to these people; you could speak to the colloquium ; you don't need to be polished; yes, you're good enough to do this; please send me your letter; please apply." There's a lot of that involved.

(But, as will be discussed below, the flattery is sincere, and is a way of encouraging teacher participation and a way of promoting self-confidence in teachers.)

TLCs make many initial contacts on a casual basis, what one might call 'leadership in the ladies room'. One TLC explained: "I do a lot of individual talking. If you see people in the hallways. . ."

TLCs know their teachers, and they offer something they believe will be attractive. They have a budget over which they have some discretion, and the PSPDC agreed, philosophically, to pay teachers for participation in certain activities. They were also able to offer college credits for particular classes or sessions. One said,

It depends on who it is that I am dealing with. I have to know what will get them. If it is pay that will interest them, I focus on that; if they need college credit, I focus on that.

They frequently surveyed their staffs, at faculty meetings or in memo form, to determine teacher interests, then tried to match interests with PSPDC needs.

So I looked . . . first of all . . . for everybody who had said they wanted to do something. I went back and I looked to see if there was something on the list, some coordinator type of person that would be drawing on . . . those same skills and interests. And for most people, indeed there were.

This notion of matching operates, too, when a TLC knows that a teacher is interested in a role, but is not an appropriate choice. One teacher was judged to be unstable by a TLC, and when an this teacher indicated an interest in an PSPDC position, the TLC quietly informed the principal that the choice would be a poor one. Another was selected.

TLCs appeal to the giving nature of teachers. One TLC explained as she pointed out to a teacher leader that an activity was "not going to work if we don't have you doing it."

These techniques, then, were used in order to persuade teachers in school to participate in PSPDC activities. They are personal in nature, and often seem like cajoling and flattery. They imply that the TLCs have a close personal knowledge of the teachers in their schools, and indeed, these TLCs have worked with most of their peers for a number of years.

Hypothesis Five

In the leadership role, the teacher leader coordinators attend to the feelings of all involved.

Gilligan (1982) has stated that "sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for taking care lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgement other points of view" (p. 16). Consistently, the TLCs were tuned into the feeling tone of most PSPDC situations. They were uncomfortable "taking flack" from their peers; they were also genuinely concerned with teachers' comfort level. For example, one surveyed to learn when teachers preferred to meet, then tried to accommodate the majority.

One role I don't like and was complaining about [was] trying to set the time for the meeting. So you survey everyone and you ask them their preference and the majority of the people this time wanted a morning meeting. . . And two people didn't want a morning meeting and so I had to make that decision as a leader to go with a morning meeting and I had to take the complaints from the two that didn't want it.

One TLC described a part of her role, and explained that: "[hostessing] really goes with doing the meetings, the morale building, keeping people happy and that sort of thing." Sharing

food, not incidentally, was an important part of the PSPDC; it was, as the director was fond of explaining, "a civilized thing to do".

TLCs wanted to please. TLCs wanted teachers to participate on activities of interest, and surveyed them frequently for their preferences. They rejected activities for which the interest level of the intended audience is unknown or known not to exist. For example, when one teacher perceived that she had to prepare a colloquium on a topic that was not a priority for the school, the TLC assured her that she didn't have to work with that topic.

This is our colloquium; who's going to be attending it? IF we can't get our own people to attend it, it's foolish to even have one. So that was a relief in her mind. . . For her to go to all the work of putting one together and then having people say 'why in hell would I give up my afternoon to do this?' It would be better that, you know, she was still working slowly through the process than to do this whole thing and have people say --and feel that she'd failed.

Hypothesis Six

With time, Teacher Leader Coordinators established their own aura of leadership, and thereby began to legitimize their position with their peers.

One TLC has captured this notion:

It used to be that a memo would say see [TLC] or [principal], and I'd say 'gee--I'm one of two. I'm sharing this leadership with [principal]. And we'd ask for something and it would always wind up in [principal's] box and he'd give it to me. Well, now [principal] asks for something, it winds up in my box. You know, --and it's really been a shift to my leadership, and that's really a very nice feeling.

TLCs are a liaison between the PSPDC and the teachers. In their role of liaison they, as described earlier, do respond to the needs expressed by their peers in the schools as well as the PSPDC. All assume full responsibility for activities at their site. If another teacher does not meet an obligation, the TLC will. One TLC explained her feeling of responsibility for an PSPDC committee:

... we've only had one meeting where somebody from our school has attended, and I was the one that went. We are now on our second person who's supposed to go to the meetings. And so if that person doesn't go this time, I will be having to find a third person, which I assume will probably be me, because I can't keep asking people who don't go.

TLCs have access to and share information with the teachers at their schools. They communicate with teachers on a regular basis. Memos are preferred by one TLC, but all share PSPDC happenings with teachers and offer opportunities for teacher participation.

TLCs monitor other teachers work with the PSPDC. They check to see that the teacher have access to funds and supplies. They coordinate meetings for teachers, trying to find mutually compatible times. They attend to such chores as preparing notebooks of information for them. TLCs provide support by attending meetings and sessions led by other teachers as a participant. They take a small role in an activity led by another teacher.

One TLC described her assistance:

... he went out and got the food and I mean he's done all this stuff, and he's just thrilled! I mean, he's just as happy as a clam. I'll go to him, and I'll say, (---), what do you need? And he'll say, 'I've done this, and I've done this.' And he'll say 'What do you think?' And I'll say 'now what do you want me to do' and he'll tell me what he wants me to do, like 'well, could you help to check to make sure the room's cleaned up afterward; do you think I should call so and so? And do you think we'll have too many people?' So he's

been --he's just off and running. And I just every once in a while say things to him like 'do you need money? Do you know how to get the money if you need it?'

When asked for their "greatest accomplishment" with the PSPDC, each TLC mentioned being able to involve other teachers with PSPDC activities.

I'm finding some people who are willing to do stuff --and are having success doing it. . . My view of teacher leadership is that everybody at some time gets to be a leader somehow, and it would be nice if I could see as many people having that opportunity who are ready to do that. . . and people starting to try some things and take some risks and becoming more engaged.

The TLC is a teacher, guide, and protector for other teacher leaders. TLCs redefine roles for other teachers. When one teacher agreed to take a job, then became apprehensive about the scope of the chore, one TLC reassured him:

After he had gone to that first meeting, every time he saw me, he complained: "this thing (TLC)'s making me do!" He saw it after he talked to her [the project director] as a lot more work than when I talked to her. And I kept saying to him, "No, (teacher), you're only doing this segment of what she's talking about. Other people may be doing *this* segment, --all you and I talked about was *this* segment. Don't lose sight of what's going on."

TLCs make teachers feel wanted and needed and take great joy in their accomplishments. One TLC described another teacher:

She was so isolated before, and now people have gotten to know her and appreciate her, and she's really taken on some wonderful leadership. . . You know, speaking at faculty meetings. . . There's been some really nice growth in leadership.

As the TLCs take responsibility not only for making sure that rooms and equipment are reserved and other such practicalities of managing the activities of the PSPDC but as they take responsibility for the success and professional growth of teachers in their buildings, then they are demonstrating leadership. As teachers turn to the TLCs for guidance, help, and the answers to questions, the teachers are recognizing the TLC's legitimate right to leadership.

Discussion and Practical Implications

The status of the participants in a collaborative effort interacts with the participants' ability to lead. Teachers' status in a PSPDC is unlike others' in the PSPDC; it is also unlike the status of their peers. Learning new roles is always problematic. In the creating of a professional development school, a difficulty lies in the not-knowing, the need to operate in the concrete while creating a vision in the abstract. Further, the difficulty is evident when teachers and others in professional development schools try out these new roles, roles for which there is no history and no common meaning in the minds of their peers nor in the norms of the profession. For the actors, the roles may be amorphous and, as such, difficult to sustain.

The professional development school that is the setting for this study has carefully and deliberately attempted to encourage teacher leadership. It has offered leadership training for teachers, and it has encouraged teacher participation. It has listened to the teacher voice. It has valued the teacher. Even with this appropriate attitude, misconceptions occurred, and an "us/them" attitude was in evidence. It is imperative that both the university and the schools, if they are to form the symbiotic partnership that Goodlad and Sirotnik (1988) envision, continue to work to break down such barriers. The creation of trust may be the biggest challenge facing teacher leaders and they organizations in which they work.

Nevertheless, it appears that the the TLCs are creating an aura of leadership; as they

continue to legitimize their position as teacher leaders, they should become even more effective with teachers whom they currently tend to avoid. As teacher leaders increase their visibility in their schools and stand as spokespersons for the PSPDC beyond their schools, they are accorded respect that enhances their position as leader. Legitimization of the position is particularly important if the notion of teachers as leaders is to be institutionalized and as other teachers are asked to replace the original cadre.

Particularly important is the fact that the TLCs appear to hear and value their peers. This characteristic is especially important as the TLCs ask peers to participate beyond the ordinary work day. However, if it is used merely to prevent damaged teacher egos, then it may cause the teacher leader to be less effective. On the other hand, as it is used to create situations where genuine needs are met, it is a most valuable tool for garnering further teacher involvement.

If it is true that teacher leaders' knowing their peers and offering them what they need is a critical characteristic of teacher leadership, then organizations and teachers who desire to include new or younger teachers will need to attend to ways in which new-comers gain access to the system. The alternative is to hope that new-comers will hang around long enough to be accepted by the established staff.

Currently, many educators claim that creating new roles for teachers that are stimulating and empowering is essential for improving education for all children, and if these new leadership roles fall outside the traditional roles for teachers, then an understanding of shared leadership in a collaborative professional development center may provide insights into how teachers might learn to function effectively in this unfamiliar role. This is especially important since the teacher leaders who initially join a movement such as a PDS may be natural leaders. By studying them, we may learn of methods by which they influence their peers and share leadership with others in their environment that may need to be more directly taught to the next wave of PDS teacher leaders.

Bibliography

- Apple, M. W. (1989) *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledg.
- Bass, B.M. (1981) *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*, 2nd. rev. ed. New York: Free Press.
- Belenky, M.F.; Clinchy, B. M.; Goldberger, N. R.; Tarule, J. M. (1986) *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Bennis, W. (1989) *On becoming a leader*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, R. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brandt, R. (1985) On teacher career development: A conversation with Philip Schlechty, *Educational Leadership*, November.
- Brownlee, G. (1979) "Characteristics of teacher leaders. *Educational Horizons*. Spring.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986) *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*.
- Gehrke, N. (1987) *On being a teacher*. West Lafayette, IN.: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Gilligan, C (1982) *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Goodlad, J. (1988) "School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts, in *School-university partnerships in action*, Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad, eds. New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.
- Goodlad, J. and Sirotnik, K., eds. (1988) *School-university partnerships in action*. New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.
- Goodlad, J. (1984) *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hallinger, P. and Richardson, D. (1988) *Models of shared leadership: evolving structures and relationships*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans) ED310490
- Hilton, C. D. 1988; The roles and Responsibilities of the critical actors. One paper from a collection: An induction program that invigorates the new and experienced. Report for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Boston. ED 299661
- The Holmes Group. (1986) *Tomorrow's teachers*. The Holmes Group, Inc. 501 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034.

- Lieberman, A. (1988) Introduction to *Building a professional culture in schools*. Ann Lieberman, ed. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Little, J. W. (1988) "Teachers as Colleagues." In *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. Ann Lieberman, ed. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Lortie, D. (1975) *Schoolteacher*. The University of Chicago press: Chicago
- Miller, J. B. (1976,) *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Osterman, K. F. (1989) Supervision and shared authority: A study of principal and teacher control in six urban middle schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco) ED307678
- Ouichi, W. G. (1981) *Theory Z*. New York: Avon Books.
- Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. (1982) *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Post, J. C. (1985) *Distinguishing leadership and management: A new consensus*. Paper presented at the O.D. Network National Conferences, San Francisco, CA.
- Sarason, S. B. (1971) *The culture of the school and the problem of change*, 2nd. Ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Silver, L. R. (1988) January "Deference to authority in the feminized professions. *School Library Journal*, p. 21 -27.
- Spencer, D. A. (1986) *Contemporary women teachers*. New York: Longman.
- Washington Education Association (n.d.) *Restructuring the public education: Building a learning community*.
- Wasley, P. (1989) *The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice: A study of lead teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Wasley, P. (1990) Working together: *Teacher leadership and collaboration*, in press ASCD.
- Zimpher, N. L. (1988) A design for the professional development of Teacher Leaders. *Journal of Teacher Education*, January/February, p. 53 - 60.